ORIGINAL

9

6

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

Arizona Corporation Commission

ROBERT "BOB" BURNS - Chairman OCKETED ANDY TOBIN

BOYD DUNN

SANDRA D. KENNEDY

JUSTIN OLSON

COMMISSIONERS

AZ CORP COMMISSION

2019 FEB 14 A II: 42

DOCKETED B

FEB 1 4 2019

IN THE MATTER OF THE RATE REVIEW AND EXAMINATION OF THE BOOKS AND RECORDS OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, AND ITS AFFILIATES, SUBSIDIARIES, AND PINNACLE WEST CAPITAL CORPORATION.

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-19-0003

PROCEDURAL ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

On January 9, 2019, the Arizona Corporation Commission's ("Commission's") Utilities Division ("Staff") filed a Memorandum requesting a new docket be opened for a rate review of Arizona Public Service Company, and its affiliates, subsidiaries, and Pinnacle West Capital Corporation (collectively "APS").

On January 31, 2019, a Request to Intervene was filed by Stacey Champion, who is a residential customer of APS and a Complainant in another pending docket involving APS, Docket No. 01345A-18-0002, which concerns whether APS's most recently approved rates and charges are reasonable.

On February 6, 2019, APS filed Opposition to Ms. Champion's Request to Intervene, asserting that Ms. Champion's alleged interest in this matter, as an APS customer and Complainant in another APS matter, does not rise to the level required to intervene under A.A.C. R14-3-105(A). APS asserts that because this matter is exclusively for a rate review—an extensive and thorough review and examination by the Commission's Utilities Division ("Staff") of APS's customer education and outreach program as well as an assessment of whether APS earned within authorized limits in 2018 it will result in a Staff report to the Commission rather than a Commission action. APS states that Staff's report may cause the Commission to decide that additional proceedings are warranted and acknowledges that a person could potentially have a direct interest in the additional proceedings if the Commission were to consider action that could materially affect the rights of APS or its customers. But APS asserts that until then, a person could not have a direct and substantial interest in this matter. APS adds that Staff's report in this matter will be made public and that Ms. Champion would have an opportunity to make public comment. APS requests that Ms. Champion's request for intervention be denied or, if the Commission believes that Ms. Champion's intervention may nevertheless be warranted, that a ruling on intervention be held in abeyance until Staff files its report in this matter.

On February 8, 2019, Ms. Champion filed her Response to APS's Opposition. In her Response, Ms. Champion asserts that the level of her interest not only meets the Commission's standard for intervention but also ties directly to the Commission's purpose and the laws that created it. Ms. Champion quotes at length from a filing made by Chairman Burns in Docket No. RU-00000A-17-0035 regarding the need for transparency and disclosure rules and the history of the Commission and also references a recent Commission case involving another utility in which the deadline for intervention was extended by the Commission. Ms. Champion asserts that she "is interested in seeing how the sausage is made, not blindly eating the sausage after the fact and getting food poisoning."

A rate review typically consists of a process by Staff that is akin to an extensive audit through which Staff determines whether a utility is correctly applying its tariffed rates and whether it is overearning. The rate review in this matter is unusual in that the Commission has also tasked Staff specifically with analyzing APS's customer education and outreach program related to its most recent rate increase. While Ms. Champion's interest in this rate review is not as strong as it would be in a general rate case, it appears that Ms. Champion would have an interest in ensuring that the Commission receives the most accurate information possible concerning APS's application of its tariffed rates and the extent of APS's customer education and outreach program, both of which she can speak to first hand as a customer. Thus, Ms. Champion's interest in this matter is sufficiently direct and substantial to grant her request for intervention.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Stacey Champion's Request to Intervene is hereby granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any motion, other than a dispositive motion, that is filed in this matter and that is not ruled upon within 20 calendar days of the filing date of the motion shall be deemed denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any response to a motion other than a dispositive motion shall be filed within seven calendar days of the filing date of the motion.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any response to a dispositive motion shall be filed within 10 calendar days of the filing date of the motion.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any reply to a response shall be filed within five calendar days of the filing date of the response.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all parties must comply with Arizona Supreme Court Rules 31, 38, 39, and 42 and A.R.S. § 40-243 with respect to the practice of law and admission *pro hac vice*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that withdrawal of representation must be made in compliance with A.A.C. R14-3-104(E) and Rule 1.16 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (under Arizona Supreme Court Rule 42). Representation before the Commission includes appearances at all hearings and procedural conferences, as well as all Open Meetings for which the matter is scheduled for discussion, unless counsel has previously been granted permission to withdraw by the Administrative Law Judge or the Commission.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Ex Parte Rule (A.A.C. R14-3-113 - Unauthorized Communications) applies to this proceeding and shall remain in effect until the Commission's Decision in this matter is final and non-appealable.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the time periods specified herein shall not be extended pursuant to Rule 6(a)(2) or (c) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

Order Regarding Consent to Email Service issued in this matter on January 11, 2019, for additional information regarding the process to consent to service by email. Information regarding Consent to Email Service is also available on the Commission's website (www.azcc.gov) by first clicking on "I Want To" and then clicking on "Learn About Consenting to Email Service" or "Consent to Email Service in a Case."

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Law Judge may rescind, alter, amend, or waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at hearing. DATED this 14th day of February, 2019. SARAH N. HARPRING ASSISTANT CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

1 2 3	On this day of February, 2019, the foregoing document was filed with Docket Control as a Procedural Order Regarding Intervention, and copies of the foregoing were mailed on behalf of the Hearing Division to the following who have not consented to email service. On this date or as soon as possible thereafter, the Commission's eDocket program will automatically email a link to the foregoing to the following who have consented to email service.
4	Thomas A. Loquvam
5	Thomas L. Mumaw ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY
6	400 N. 5th St. MS 8695
7	Phoenix, Arizona 85004
8	Stacey Champion 3101 N. Central Ave, Suite 174
9	Phoenix, AZ 85012 sc@champion-pr.com
10	Consented to Service by Email
11	Robin Mitchell, Director Legal Division
12	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
13	Phoenix, AZ 85007
14	LegalDiv@azcc.gov utildivservicebyemail@azcc.gov Consented to Service by Email
15	COASH & COASH, INC.
16	Court Reporting, Video and Videoconferencing
17	1802 North 7 th Street Phoenix, AZ 85006
18	Emailed as a courtesy
19	
20	By: Grace Beltran
	Assistant to Sarah N. Harpring
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	